

MEMO ENDORSED

Thompson Wigdor & Gilly LLP ATTORNEYS AND COUNSILORS AT LAW \$5 Fifth Avenu ork, NY 1990 Tel 212.257.630 Fax 212.257.684 Kenneth P. Thomps www.twglaw.co kthompson@twglaw comSDS SDNY CHAHBERS OF DOCUMENT COLLEEN MOMALION February 2, 2010ELECTRONICALLY FILE DOC#: DATE FILED: BY FACSIMIL Honorable Colleen McMahon United States District Judge **United States District Court** Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, New York 10007

Moises Mendez v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc., Re:

No. 08 Civ. 4967 (CM)(KNF)

Dear Judge McMahon:

We represent Plaintiff Moises Mendez ("Mr. Mendez") in the above-referenced matter, and respectfully write in opposition to the letter by Defendant Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc. ("Starwood"), dated January 27, 2010, requesting a further adjournment of the trial that is currently scheduled to commence on February 16, 2010 (see ECF #97).

As Your Honor may recall, Defendant has consistently grasped at all possible opportunities for delaying the progression of this case, which was originally scheduled for trial to commence on March 9, 2009 (see ECF #30).1 Although discovery in this case was completed more than one year ago, on January 9, 2009 (see ECF #40), Defendant is now requesting that the Court delay the trial yet again, this time on the grounds of a purported scheduling conflict with regard to one of Defendant's witnesses, Dr. Andrew P. Levin, Starwood's paid testifying expert who conducted an independent psychiatric examination of Mr. Mendez for approximately four and one-quarter hours on December 12, 2008.

We have consistently opposed each of Defendant's attempts to delay trial of this case, including Defendant's motions to dismiss (see ECF #18, 21 and 23), to stay discovery (see ECF #29), and to adjourn the trial (see ECF #54), as well as Defendant's interlocutory appeal (see ECF #50) and motion for a stay of trial by the Second Circuit (see ECF #45).

Thompson Wigdor & Gilly LLP Attorneys and counseloss at law

Honorable Colleen McMahon February 2, 2010 Page 2

Defendant's request to once again postpone Mr. Mendez's day in court based on the alleged travel plans of a witness retained by Defendant for the sole purpose of providing paid testimony at trial is unreasonable and would result in unfair prejudice to Mr. Mendez, his co-workers, and doctors who have been subpoenaed to testify as part of his case-in-chief and have arranged their schedules accordingly. Indeed, a number of the witnesses identified by Plaintiff during the final pretrial conference on October 16, 2009 have been subjected to apparent acts of intimidation and/or retaliation by Defendant over the past 14 weeks, including disparate acts of workplace discipline against employees who, in some cases, were never subject to any form of discipline during their more than five-year careers with Defendant.

Furthermore, to the extent that Dr. Levin's presence is genuinely required at an "out of town" location from February 22 to March 3, there is no reason why Defendant cannot have him return to New York for a few hours to testify following the completion of Mr. Mendez's case-in-chief, or simply forego his testimony altogether if Defendant is unwilling to bear this responsibility.

Accordingly, we respectfully request that Defendant's latest attempt to delay the trial again be rejected in its entirety, and that Mr. Mendez be permitted to begin presenting his case before a jury on February 16, 2010 as scheduled, and without Dr. Levin being allowed to be called before Mr. Mendez completes his case-in-chief.

Thank you for Your Honor's consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Kenneth P. Thompson

CC: Scott B. Gilly, Esq. Ari Graff, Esq. Michael Starr, Esq.

Loren L. Forrest, Jr., Esq.